HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 47 Saturday, November 23, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

RIGHT TO WORK: *Mitchell at the brink* (page 1)

ADLAI: *"Bipartisan" confusion* (page 1)

NATO: *Who controls missiles?* (page 2)

Toward a world government (page 3)

GIRARD: *Senate investigation looms* (page 2)

"Mitchell Must Go": The amiable but devious Secretary of Labor, Jim Mitchell, has added to Administration headaches by an incredible, though subtle, statement which has pleased the Labor Bosses and brought congressional demands that he resign from the Cabinet.

What Mitchell did was to align Ike's Republican regime on the side of the Labor Bosses in their opposition to the one big country-wide, popular demand: to end compulsory membership in trade unions — that is, to pass right-to-work legislation. At a time when "labor power" is as unpopular as "financial power" was 25 years ago, the presently declining modern Republican Executive finds itself arrayed against the "wave of the future," thanks to Mitchell.

The so-called GOP Secretary of Labor, never known as a Republican until he was appointed, has come out again, not only stating his personal opposition to right-to-work legislation (he has often done this), but also indicating (what he has never dared to say before) that the Administration would also oppose such legislation if it came up in Congress after the first of the year. The clever Secretary (whose wiles are well known now to members of Congress) actually said that the Administration would not back any such legislation, but the implications of his statement and the realities of the developing situation all point to active opposition from the White House if a right-to-work measure gets under way on Capitol Hill.

This week, Congressman Ralph Gwinn of New York (now ranking Republican member of the House Labor and Education Committee) reacted sharply against the Mitchell stand. He said that any Cabinet member, reflecting "special interests" such as Labor, and "propagandizing against laws banning compulsory unionism, should leave the Cabinet."

Rising congressional indignation in the wake of the Mitchell statement springs not only from this episode, but also from the following counts in a long indictment of Mitchell's reign:

(1) Mitchell once publicly sought amendment of the Taft-Hartley law so as to forbid the states to enact their own right-to-work laws.

(2) He has pursued a policy of extending minimum wage coverage to millions of people, including employees of retail stores operating in interstate commerce, against bitter opposition of business groups. He has never (as was expected when the Republicans came to power) moved for contracting the scope of this dangerously inflationary measure.

(3) He has consistently tried to dilute laws restricting the power of the Labor Bosses; he has never pushed a piece of legislation to restrict Labor Boss power which in a showdown would be unacceptable to them.

(4) He has kept the personnel of the Labor Department much the same as it was under Truman. He has opposed naming, to the key National Labor Relations Board, candidates (many of them "Taftmen") who were known to favor reform of the current evils of the labor movement.

(5) Despite his denials, members of Congress are convinced that Mitchell has had full legal power all the time to uncover and reform the flagrant evils exposed this year by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee. Like his Democratic predecessors, he simply failed to do so, apparently because of his pro-labor bias. Chairman Barden (D.-N.C.) of the House Labor and Education Committee has made this charge repeatedly.

Finally, Capitol Hill is now saying that Mitchell owed his appointment originally to the influence of Merlyn Pitzele, now under a cloud because of his exposure by the McClellan Committee. Pitzele (see HUMAN EVENTS for November 9, 1957) confessed that he had been on Dave Beck's payroll at a time when he was serving on the New York State Labor Mediation Board. A long-time intimate and adviser of former Governor Dewey on labor matters, Pitzele had to resign his position as Labor Editor of *Business Week* as a result of his exposure.

Operation Cross-Eyed: The naming of twice-beaten Democratic candidate Adlai Stevenson as "consultant" to the State Department comes as a climax to a series of episodes, behind the scenes in the Administration, revealing the jerky and contradictory directions pursued by those at the top. One day for coexistence, the next against that policy; another day against a meeting with Khrushchev, the next apparently regarding it favorably — such is the picture of snafu given to the public.

The series of events begins, according to private information given to HUMAN EVENTS, with the day when Secretary of State Dulles first heard of the White House idea that Adlai should be taken "into the family." Dulles, in his private office, "blew off," observing bitterly that apparently he would have to deal with "another Stassen." The Secretary's dislike for Childe Harold and his appeasement policies is well known around Washington. Dulles arranged a meeting with Ike, in the hope of scuttling the appointment.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the White House with the President, Dulles argued cogently that Stevenson's appointment would offend Capitol Hill (which it has, in reality) and that not more than 15 Senators of both parties would favor Adlai or trust him. The President replied that there must be "bipartisanship" and asked: Who else is there in the Democratic Party that we could get? Dulles — for his pains — suggested Truman, whom he said most of the Senators personally liked, whether they agreed with him or not (which is true).

At that Ike "hit the ceiling," exclaiming that he did not want Truman in the State Department, in the White House, or "anywhere else." The Secretary of State retired, more than crestfallen.

Meanwhile, friends of Dulles become impatient with one of the Secretary's own contradictory moves, a wit remarking that Dulles has "lent one of his several countenances" to the one-world ideas of a whole squad of former Truman aides. This was a reference to a group of Trumanites whom Dulles asked to "advise" the Administration on foreign policy. Dulles defended himself by saying, "well, the White House wanted me to get Acheson in. But that man I can never tolerate."

Such is the picture of confusion and antipathies and cross-purposes which these reports bring out. On Capitol Hill, many say that bipartisanship is fundamentally wrong anyway; that the Administration should follow a consistent, principled policy; that the role of the opposition is to "oppose"; and that only by this procedure can representative parliamentary government function properly.

Eisenhower's dislike for Truman, it is said, dates back much further than the days of the 1952 campaign, when Ike reacted angrily against some of the former President's sharp forensic criticisms. It began — insiders say — back in 1947, when Ike was Chief of Staff and Truman cut a big swath out of Ike's military budget, to the latter's distress.

IN 20 MINUTES

You Can Solve Your Christmas Gift Problem.

That's all it takes — just 20 minutes — to write the names and addresses of the friends to whom you want to send Christmas gifts.

Send them HUMAN EVENTS, the gift that will remind them of you 52 times a year.

Two or more three-month subscriptions, $2.50 each; two or more six-month subscriptions, $5 each; two or more annual subscriptions, $9 each.

Missiles: Congressional circles remain very cautious about what the President can or will accomplish for American security at the forthcoming North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conference in Paris. One point stressed by these circles is that the United States must have decisive control over missiles, equipment and operation in foreign countries. What happens if — because of internal political dissension or subversion — the Government of one of these countries should refuse to fire our missiles against the enemy? Such pointed questions will be asked at the conference between the President and congressional leaders next week. (See "NATO" item, below.)

Meanwhile, along diplomatic row, it is pointed out that the US has not announced intentions of placing missiles and firing equipment in Formosa and Korea, both under Governments faithful to the US, and both of which face the rising military power of Red China. Red Chinese radio propaganda voices threats of using Soviet missiles against these countries. Diplomatic row also remarks that the next Red lunge may take place in the Far East, not in Europe, to catch the US — absorbed in European preparations — off balance.

It is not generally known, but well-placed sources inform HUMAN EVENTS *that atomic warheads and missiles are now stored on Okinawa. To form an effective deterrent against Red plans, however, they obviously should be placed in Formosa and Korea.*

Killian: Researchers in Washington have been scanning the record of new US missile "czar" James R. Killian, and they are not favorably impressed with what they find. For Killian, it appears, has shown himself disturbingly ignorant of even the simplest security requirements.

Cited by those who question the "czar's" capacity to run a tough anti-Communist program are several of his statements while he was at MIT. Killian showed extreme reluctance to part with the services of MIT Professor Dirk J. Struik, accused by Herbert Philbrick of spreading Communist philosophy; Killian remarked, in 1949, concerning Communist party membership on the part of his faculty members, that "MIT takes the view that this is a matter of personal opinion. It is our policy not to inquire as to the personal beliefs of our staff."

In a 1948 statement before a Massachusetts investigating committee, concerning a bill to bar Communists from teaching positions, Killian stated: "The bill says in effect that the responsible officer of an educational institution should be a person so omniscient that he must be able to tell a Communist when he sees one, or be prepared at any time to determine what the doctrines of the Communist party may be on that particular day, and to determine whether any member of the staff of his institution, orally or in writing, has advocated any of these doctrines. I submit, gentlemen, that this is not only impossible, but dangerous."

The disturbing question arises: if Killian found it so difficult to keep Communists from infiltrating a school, will he be able to take the measures necessary to keep them from infiltrating the sprawling US missile project?

Girard: This week's verdict by the Japanese court trying Specialist 3/C William S. Girard fulfils to the letter analyses prevalent in Washington last May and June, when the Girard case first broke into the public consciousness. The court convicted Girard of the Japanese equivalent of manslaughter in the firing-range slaying of Mrs. Naka Sakai, and sentenced him to three years' imprisonment. The sentence, pending appeal, was suspended.

Immediately, American defenders of the Administration decision to surrender Girard, such as Vermont Senators Flanders and Aiken, announced that because Girard "got off easy," the value of the "Status of Forces" agreements had been demonstrated.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This sequence coincides exactly with the forecast reported in HUMAN EVENTS for June 8, 1957: that Girard would be "surrendered to appease anti-American sentiment in Japan . . .; then, the Japanese authorities try him and let him off with a 'suspended' sentence. This outcome can then be broadcast around the United States as 'proof' of the 'fairness' of the Status of Forces Treaties."

Some legislators, however, were not so quick to voice this line. Democratic Senators Ervin (N.C.) and Russell (Ga.) renewed their previous criticism of the decision to yield jurisdiction over Girard. Congressman Frank T. Bow (R.-Ohio), chief nemesis of "Status of Forces" partisans in the bureaucracy, told HUMAN EVENTS this week that he will not be swayed from his efforts to have the agreements revised to protect American servicemen.

Another indication of continued pressure for revision came from Senator George Malone (R.-Nev.). Malone was among the first to point out the fallacy of the argument that a soldier's "beating the rap" justified the treaties (see HUMAN EVENTS for July 20, 1957). This week, Malone, contacted at his home in Reno, had this exclusive comment for HUMAN EVENTS:

"The arguments being advanced in the wake of the Japanese decision underline what I said to HUMAN EVENTS in July. Because Girard 'got off easy,' it does not follow that the decision to turn him over was justified. The American Government stipulated throughout the whole controversy that Girard was on duty at the time of the incident, and thus the only possible reason for turning him over must have been to appease left-wing sentiment in Japan. For this reason, I don't think many Senators or Representatives will be diverted by the 'suspended sentence' business. The charge of appeasement still stands, and the evil has not been corrected. We have completely deserted the boys in our Armed Services, once they leave our shores."

Malone concluded: "A full Senate investigation of the handling of the Girard case by the Executive Branch should be high on the agenda at the next session of Congress."

After you finish reading* HUMAN EVENTS, *pass it on to a friend.

NATO: Liberals and conservatives alike see the impending December meeting of NATO in Paris as a long step toward turning this military alliance into an "Atlantic Union" type of government, binding the United States by the decisions of France, England and other NATO members. Reports from London, moreover, suggest a willingness, in US State Department circles, to surrender the power of decision on when and where to use American intermediate range missiles based in Western Europe.

In his news conference this week, it is believed, Secretary Dulles was attempting to allay American fears that NATO countries could veto US nuclear or IRBM retaliation against the Communists. Dulles said: "I do not think any Government can legally, constitutionally, give another government a veto over action which it might deem indispensable for its own national survival."

Students of US "cold war" strategy, however, cite a number of facts that indicate (a) that the US has already surrendered a large, if undefined, portion of its military sovereignty to NATO; and (b) that further such surrenders are in the making.

It is pointed out that, thanks to a military veto possessed by America's NATO "partners," Communist aggression was able to achieve a substantial victory in the Korean war. For the refusal of the United States to bomb Communist bases north of the Yalu river arose in large part because our air power could not be so used without the consent of Britain and France.

As Professor Anthony Bouscaren pointed out in HUMAN EVENTS for August 18, 1956, the US turned the tables on Britain and France during last year's crisis over Suez, and "vetoed" their "get-tough" ideas about dealing with Nasser. In what way, it is asked, did these NATO-generated "vetoes" aid anyone but the Communists? And what will happen at the next crucial moment when decisive action against the Reds is necessary?

A portent of more disastrous frustration of anti-Communist action, and more decisive subordination of American sovereignty, is seen in the appointment of the Administration's new adviser on foreign affairs, Adlai Stevenson. Stevenson's early statements have all been aimed at a thorough and noxious entanglement of American policy in the counsels of Europe. If serious acceptance is given Stevenson-type recommendations to "pool" our scientific information, to give up all autonomy in the formulation of US foreign policy, and to yield to European nations such vital decisions as when and where to use American missiles, then — conservatives believe — submersion beneath the waves of "world government," long advocated by left-wing legislators, is not too remote a prospect.

An intensifying campaign to polish up the old "Atlantic Union" idea and to re-sell it to the American people is now well under way. Coordinating efforts to gain public backing for the scheme is the Atlantic Union Committee, headed by Elmo Roper. HUMAN EVENTS has obtained a copy of a letter circulated last month by Roper. The letter discloses that the National Planning Association — a "liberal" business organization — is "to undertake a study of the economic implications of Atlantic Union." It also relates that "Chris Sonne, the Chairman of the National Planning Association, has now openly affiliated himself with the Atlantic Union Committee." The proposed NPA study of Atlantic Union's "probable economic benefits," outlined in a six-page "confidential" memorandum, is to cost $85,000. (For additional information on NPA, see "The National Information Bureau," by Felix Wittmer, in Article Section of this issue.)

Conservative Congressmen with long memories are keeping a close eye, in this developing campaign, on Under Secretary of State Christian Herter. For it is recalled that "modern Republican" Herter, as a member of the House, was among the sponsors of a 1951 resolution in favor of "Atlantic Union."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bound Volumes for 1957 — with index — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; prepublication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each. Bound, indexed volumes for 1955 and 1956 available at $15. None available for previous years.

Integration Briefs: Seen as a direct result of the Federal invasion of Little Rock, Arkansas — as well as of local "integration" issues — was the defeat this month of Cincinnati's Vice Mayor Theodore M. Berry, seeking a fifth term as a member of the City Council. Reports from Cincinnati indicate that Berry, a Negro, was defeated because of a general rise of anti-integration sentiment, and because white citizens connected his presence on the Council with an "urban redevelopment" project that is sending large numbers of Negroes into predominantly white residential areas in the suburbs. Conclusion: the Cincinnati election may be evidence that forced integration will create the phenomenon of a "white vote."

● George Lichner, a student at Kelly High School in Chicago, has been suspended from school, arrested for "disorderly conduct," subjected to a psychiatric examination and placed under court supervision for deviationist behavior. His offense: drawing up a petition asking for segregated schools.

● In Robeson County, North Carolina, school authorities have set about providing separate educational facilities for a little-known minority group, the Smiling Indians. Other Indians in Robeson County refuse to integrate with the Smilings; the Smilings refuse to integrate with Negroes.

● Arousing the ire of parents in New York in recent months has been an NAACP-backed plan for "racial balance" in New York city schools, based on the theory that integration should consist of a constant ratio between white and Negro attendance throughout the school system. Because schools normally service surrounding or nearby residential areas, this concept is seen as indicating two possible lines of advance for the further plans of the NAACP: (1) intensified pressure on ending the "residential segregation" which exists in every city in the United States; (2) a broad program of shuffling students about — in some cases for distances measurable in hours of travelling time — to achieve the "balance" dictated as proper by the NAACP.

Hiss-Chambers Play: First-nighters in Baltimore this week expressed their approval at the opening of a new play, "A Shadow of My Enemy," based on the Hiss-Chambers case. The play, decribed as a faithful and strongly anti-Communist dramatization of the famous hearings and trials, will open at Washington's National Theater, November 25, and run until December 7. After its trial run in the Capital, it will proceed to Broadway.

Book Front: *The American Cause*, by Russell Kirk; Henry Regnery Co.; 172 pp.; $3.50.

Noting the grim fact that many American soldiers captured during the Korean war succumbed to Communist "brainwashing" because they were ignorant of the principles upon which the United States is founded, Russell Kirk here offers an easily understood primer of Americanism, in its moral, political and economic aspects. *The American Cause* is a useful handbook which could profitably be distributed as a text for students in high schools and colleges.

● *Yankee G-Man*, by Frederick Ayer, Jr.; Regnery; 312 pp.; $5.

This is an always absorbing and frequently amusing memoir by a former Special Agent of the FBI. Among its personal highlights are a number of revelations with considerable political significance. (Example: biographical sleuthing on a candidate for Government preferment disclosed the "twin facts that he had been a notorious homosexual and a leading member of three Communist party groups. . . ." Nevertheless, Ayer relates, "this applicant was welcomed into a Government agency apparently with open arms — and so far as I know, rapidly promoted.")

● *Will the Middle East Go West?* by Freda Utley; Regnery; 198 pp.; $3.

Indicting previous Western policy failures — particularly its support of Zionist ambitions — Miss Utley, author of *The China Story*, presents a case sympathetic to the course pursued by Egypt's Premier Nasser, whose leadership of the Arabs, she believes, "is not to be denied." Her proposed solution: "America must give the Arab states a definite assurance that provided they will accept the existence of Israel within boundaries set by the United Nations and make peace with her, we shall not permit the Arab world to be drowned out by Anglo-French or Zionist imperialists."

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

CHARLES EDISON, former Governor of New Jersey: "As a reader of HUMAN EVENTS for several years, I was delighted to learn from actual experience what an appreciated gift it could be at Christmas time. Last Christmas I gave several subscriptions to friends and they are repeatedly reminding me of their appreciation. To me, HUMAN EVENTS serves as a wonderful antidote to the political news which, all too often, is slanted, innocently or purposely, to the Left."

Additional copies of this 4-page News Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 47 HUMAN EVENTS November 23, 1957

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU

By FELIX WITTMER

Felix Wittmer here offers evidence to show that NIB, purportedly an "impartial" reporting service advising corporations and wealthy individuals on their charitable and educational contributions, seems to have a partiality for "liberal" educational projects.

IF THE National Information Bureau, Inc. (located at 205 East 42nd Street, New York City), were run by professional "liberals," it could hardly do a more efficiently pro-"liberal" job than it has been doing for a good many years. For although it has deservedly won recognition and respectability for its efficient promotion of high standards among charitable organizations, it has played a regrettable role in passing judgment on organizations of conservative bent.

While occasionally it does not quite "clear" a society of the left-wing type, and while it has given the green light to the conservative American Enterprise Association, it has endorsed some of the most dangerous associations of creeping and open socialism. At times it has dealt damaging blows to our most worthwhile advocates of the free market and limited government.

Originally organized to evaluate national health and welfare agencies, NIB has from its beginning in 1918 been in close contact with Community Chests. In fact, in recent years Community Chests and Councils of America have supplied about 20 per cent of NIB's modest income. Thus, if you are a contributor to Community Chests and Councils of America, you also, as a result of NIB's strange reports, aid and abet various collectivist outfits and scare hundreds of private corporations into withdrawing support from some of their most devoted, intelligent and effective champions.

NIB has won praise from nationally known magazines for its admirable efforts in setting up high standards for charitable organizations, preventing donors from contributing to those which are either poorly run or outright phoney. "Suggestions by the NIB," says *Reader's Digest*, "will help protect you and your pocketbook." *Business Week* advised company executives to consult their community organizations "or the NIB when in doubt about solicitations." *The American Weekly* described NIB as "alert to protect legitimate philanthropy." *The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce Bulletin* "relies upon the findings of the NIB in which it has implicit confidence."

THE NIB STANDARDS have been defined in an eight-point set of principles which has been applied to the more than 600 organizations so far investigated. These standards are perfectly legitimate with regard to health and welfare organizations, whose business it is to collect and disburse funds with a minimum of shrinkage, but it is questionable if the same standards should be applied to educational organizations that receive money for project use, and not to give away. Their financial structure could not possibly conform with that of charities.

It is not possible for some very worthwhile organizations which by the nature of things must live from hand to mouth to meet the NIB requirement of presenting a detailed budget in advance (which is point eight on NIB's list). For quite often the advisability of a project arises spontaneously, and a large percentage of contributions are only made as new situations develop. Many corporations, furthermore, trusting the general program of an educational association, make their annual contributions without specifying any project towards which they are to be applied.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, if a reputable organization — say the American Economic Foundation in New York City — fails to supply NIB with a detailed "statement of next year's program plans translated into finances," it does not fulfill point 8, and therefore is not likely to meet NIB's requirements. A statement to this effect by NIB can appear quite ominous to an uninformed contribution committee. Once NIB reports that an organization "does not qualify under this standard," the organization is likely to lose tens of thousands of dollars in contributions, simply because large corporations do not take the risk of supporting those which have not been "cleared." No matter how well-intentioned NIB's small executive staff may be, in practice it sometimes injures some of our finest organizations engaged in informal economic education.

Many corporation officials in charge of contributions simply eliminate from their lists organizations which, while not rejected, have been placed in the doubtful category by a noncommittal NIB report. In a letter of April 9, 1953, addressed to "Dear Contributor Members," NIB states: "Simply send us the contribution list you prepare for income tax purposes. (The amounts contributed need not be included in your list.) We mark on your list each national and international organization, within this Bureau's field of review, indicating whether the organization meets minimum standards or not." In a letter of April 15, 1955, addressed to "Dear Bureau Members," NIB states: "We will note on your list whether each organization in our field (1) meets minimum standards, (2) does not meet minimum standards, (3) is in the category of a no-conclusion report." If NIB decides not to reach any conclusion, the organization thus branded may find its activities seriously curtailed through loss of otherwise available contributions.

IN SOME CASES even organizations of manifest "liberal" tendencies, such as the National Association for the United Nations and the National Issues Committee, do not meet NIB's minimum standards. In the great majority, however, they do. Thus the League of Women Voters of the United States and the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (now National Citizens Council for Public Schools) — whose left-wing penetration I have documented in chapters XII and XIII of my recent book, *Conquest of the American Mind* — have met the standards of NIB.

The American Veterans Committee, under the chairmanship of Michael Straight, former editor of the frequently pro-collectivist *New Republic*, according to NIB "has evidenced responsibility" and therefore has received a favorable NIB report (June 22, 1950). This is the Committee which has sponsored the development of the UN into a world government; food rationing; price and rent control; socialized medicine; Federal aid to education; and other collectivist schemes.

The National Planning Association, year after year, until 1955, has been listed among the "typical accredited agencies" of NIB's annual *Giver's Guide to National Philanthropies.* PEP, the Political Economic Policy Commission of Great Britain's (socialistic) Fabian Society, on April 21, 1942, termed the National Planning Association "PEP's counterpart in the United States." The now defunct League for Industrial Democracy, foremost American agency for the spreading of straight socialistic propaganda, as early as 1931 carried on the letterhead of its stationery the statement, "Endorsed by the National Information Bureau." As late as April 25, 1951, this anti-free enterprise outfit was aided and abetted by a friendly NIB report, and as late as 1955 it was listed as a "typical accredited agency" in NIB's *Giver's Guide to National Philanthropies.*

The Institute of Pacific Relations, in an NIB report of February 16, 1950, was cleared by the statement, "The Bureau knows of no reason why persons interested in the program of the Council should not contribute." Yet, unless NIB was woefully unaware of the Communist peril, it should have had plenty of reason not to endorse IPR, considering that such known pro-Communists as Joseph Fels Barnes, Frederick Vanderbilt Field and Harriet Lucy Moore had throughout the years served as executive secretaries of this organization, and that Mrs. Marguerite Stewart, wife of Maxwell Slutz Stewart (sponsor of dozens of Communist fronts) had served as acting secretary. The McCarran Hearings, held from July 25, 1951 to June 20, 1952, and documented in a 15-volume report, established beyond any doubt that this organization, cleared by NIB, was thoroughly penetrated by members of the Communist party and that it was instrumental in influencing and even guiding the pro-Communist policy of our State Department with regard to China.

There is not even an allusion to policy criticism in NIB's April 15, 1952, report on United World Federalists, a group which has as its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

object the subordination of American sovereignty to a world government. With respect to the Atlantic Union Committee, an organization of similar tendency, NIB's report of November 7, 1951, saw "no reason" why American donors "should not contribute." Right down to the present, NIB's *Giver's Guide to National Philanthropies* has listed the pro-internationalist Foreign Policy Association — the moving spirit of which is Vera Micheles Dean, an anti-anti-Communist of purest ray serene — as a "typical accredited agency." A report of February 11, 1953, praising FPA's "record of accomplishment," instructs potential donors that "it meets the standard of the NIB." (Readers of my *Conquest of the American Mind* may recall chapter XIX, in which I have documented the radical leftist character of specific FPA pamphlets.)

With regard to such advocates of the free market economy as the Foundation for Economic Education and the American Economic Foundation, NIB has raised the issue of "mass education policy." It has failed to do so in the case of the frequently left-wing Foreign Policy Association.

Consider the experience of some organizations which have combatted communism or have courageously pointed out the disintegrating character of creeping socialism. A NIB report of July 22, 1953, on the American Heritage Foundation, which has sponsored Crusade for Freedom, the National Committee for a Free Europe and Radio Free Europe, questions — by clever use of quotation marks — the activities of these organizations to "alert" Americans annually to the need to fight against communism and the "psychological battle with Moscow." Pointing out that the policies of the American Heritage Foundation are "apparently based on the belief that Americans are not alert enough now about communism," the NIB report, by unmistakable innuendo, questions the advisability of continuing contributions to this organization.

NIB's report on the Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa. (of September 4, 1951) is critical. Common Cause, Inc., an anti-Communist association which unites right-wingers with a few liberals, does not meet NIB's standard (Report of July 6, 1950).

NIB's May 1, 1952 report on Harding College's Department of National Education (a straightforward advocate of constitutional Government and free enterprise), informs potential contributors that a "glance at certain of the speeches of its leader reveals some use of misleading illustrations to prove a point." Harding College fails to meet NIB's standards.

NIB's July 16, 1952 report on Spiritual Mobilization, which has been a standard-bearer of moral, economic and political freedom, by means of quotation mark innuendo, is downright derogatory. (". . . question arises as to its competence or as to its integrity . . . excessive promotional claims, *etc.*") The Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, a competent conservative organization largely composed of recognized university professors, "fails," according to NIB report of April 22, 1953, "to meet standards 1 and 8."

Such NIB reports on the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y., as those of November 13, 1952 and June 1, 1954 attempt to analyze the economic and moral wisdom of this intelligently administered and staffed advocate of personal liberty. "At times," the 1952 report finds, "Foundation conclusions seem to rest upon sweeping assumptions as to man and society." Well, it would be very easy to document FEE's concept with quotations from John Adams, Frédéric Bastiat, Herbert Hoover, Thomas Jefferson, John Locke, Thomas Paine, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Martin Van Buren, Daniel Webster, and Woodrow Wilson — all of whom also held to some "sweeping assumptions as to man and society." Analyzing FEE concepts by quoting out of context, the 11-page 1954 report of NIB finally, of all things, refers potential contributors to the July 18, 1950 report of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities (generally known as the Buchanan Committee, after its chairman, the late Representative Buchanan, Democrat of Pennsylvania). Yet, how many corporation officials who because of this reference cancel their projected contributions to the Foundation for Economic Education are aware of the late Congressman's well-documented close association with Communist agitators?

Another outstanding conservative organization, which for years must have lost tens of thousands of dollars in contributions because it has not met NIB's charity standards of outside executive committee control, is the American Economic Foundation. Yet common sense indicates that this type of "control" could only hamper AEF's creative work and open the door to frustration and even infiltration.

NIB's unwillingness to "clear" the American Economic Foundation — in marked contrast to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its readiness in the past to endorse the Institute of Pacific Relations, the National Planning Association and the League for Industrial Democracy — has certainly done harm to the cause of objective economic education. Yet AEF's meticulously and efficiently executed work, its campaign against economic illiteracy at the mass level, is a vital contribution to the continued well-being of our society.

AEF's integrity has been praised by such ideologically divergent authorities as Henry Hazlitt (of *Newsweek*), Arthur Krock (of *The New York Times*), Fulton Oursler, Dewitt Wallace (of *Reader's Digest*), Charles Isaac (of the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.) and Edward J. Noble (of the American Broadcasting Company) — and even by its friendly enemy, Norman Thomas. Its National Schools Committee includes presidents and deans of colleges, superintendents of schools and renowned university professors. Certainly, an internationally known authority such as Louis M. Hacker, Dean of the School of General Studies, Columbia University, would not serve on it were it not of the highest standard.

The AEF classroom film discussion program, "How We Live In America," which is at present installed in systems embracing 12 per cent of the Nation's high schools, is — in the opinion of outstanding university professors — the clearest, soundest and most effective such statement available concerning the economic and moral foundations of a free civilization.

IT IS TRAGIC that the National Information Bureau, so useful in evaluation of health and charity organizations, should venture into analyzing economic concepts — a task for which it has demonstrated no special competence. Who, after all, is D. Paul Reed, NIB's executive secretary? What publications of his, according to generally accepted standards, entitle him to provide analyses of economic and governmental concepts as a basis for contributions? His literary output, it seems, is restricted to one inconsequential article on standards of welfare organizations, published in the February, 1944, issue of *Survey*, and three Letters-to-the-Editor of *The New York Times*.

While NIB's executive secretary is more than willing to delve into the background of, say, Leonard Read, President of the Foundation for Economic Education, he is singularly silent about his own. Yet, in view of D. Paul Reed's presuming to judge the views of the former Cornell professors who have served on the staff of the Foundation for Economic Education, one might wonder on the basis of what experience he has undertaken his flight into the domain of economic, social and political theory.

NIB has published the widely circulated pamphlet, *Help Keep Philanthropy True*. What does it mean by "true"? Perhaps agreement with the personal views held by the three staff members of NIB? And how has it been possible for a staff of three to analyze more than 600 organizations? Who, exactly, were those "outside volunteers" who have provided NIB with the detailed information of its reports?

NIB, instead of adhering to its original purpose of promoting high standards in charitable organizations, has found it proper to "analyze" what it characterizes as the "extreme conservative" views of the Foundation for Economic Education and the American Economic Foundation. Is it not, therefore, about time to analyze the ideological preferences of NIB? Where do the NIB staff and volunteers stand with regard to the defense of private property and limited government? What is their position on such subjects as the free market economy, labor union monopoly, and the voluntary society? These questions certainly deserve straightforward answers.

NIB, it may develop, could profit by the Biblical admonition: "Judge not, that ye be not judged." *(Matt. 7:1.)*

Dr. Felix Wittmer, author of *The Yalta Betrayal* and *Conquest of the American Mind*, is a well-known writer and lecturer on political and economic subjects. He is a member of the staff of the School of General Studies, Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED